

24



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/710,214	11/10/2000	Walter R. Bodwell	BMC1100-1	4602

44654 7590 12/15/2004

SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP  
1301 W. 25TH STREET  
SUITE 408  
AUSTIN, TX 78705

EXAMINER

LAZARO, DAVID R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/710,214	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BODWELL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> David Lazaro	<b>Art Unit</b> 2155	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. \* See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-24, and 26-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 25, 41 and 42 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **Response to Amendment**

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed 09/09/04.
2. Claims 1, 10, 12, 14, 25, 31, 35 and 37 were amended.
3. Claims 38-42 were added.
4. Claims 1-42 are pending in this Office Action.
5. The objection to claim 37 is withdrawn.

### ***Claim Objections***

6. Claim 39 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 39 should be dependent on Claim 38. Appropriate correction is required.
7. Claim 42 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 3, "fist" should be "first". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-8, 14-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 34, 35, 37-40 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,185,598 by Farber et al. (Farber).

10. With respect to Claim 1, Farber teaches a method for mediating a web page at an intermediate server (Col. 8 line 54 – Col. 9 line 8) comprising: receiving a request for the web page at an intermediate server (Col. 10 lines 13-20); forwarding the request to a target server (Col. 10 lines 39-52); retrieving the web page from a target web server (Col. 10 lines 39-52 and Col. 8 line 54-66); ensuring that the web page will not be cached (Col. 9 lines 1-8 and Col. 23 lines 5-11); and changing a dynamic link in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 27 - Col. Line 23 and note Claim 7).

11. With respect to Claim 2, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the dynamic link is a relative link, and the step of changing a relative link in the web page further comprises: if the relative link contains a base tag, modifying the base tag to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65); and if the relative link does not contain the base tag, inserting a reference base tag, wherein the reference base tag refers to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

12. With respect to Claim 3, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the step of ensuring the web page will not be cached comprises setting the web page to expire immediately (Col. 23 lines 5-11).

13. With respect to Claim 4, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches the dynamic link is an absolute URL, and further comprising identifying the absolute URL by a protocol (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 53 and Col. 6 lines 16-35).

14. With respect to Claim 5, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches the step of changing a dynamic link to the intermediate server further comprises using a host name to define the target web server associated with the web page (Col. 9 lines 45-65).

15. With respect to Claim 6, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches the step of changing a dynamic link to refer to the intermediate server further comprises using a port to define the target web server associated with the web page (Col. 7 lines 37-46).

16. With respect to Claim 7, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches identifying a resource type according to a resource source tag in the web page; and marking the resource type (Col. 16 line 66 – Col. 17 line 11).

17. With respect to Claim 8 Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches changing a document.domain script command to refer to a domain for the intermediate server (Col 16 line 52- Col. 17 line 11).

18. With respect to Claim 14, Farber teaches a system for mediating a web page at an intermediate server (Col. 8 line 54 – Col. 9 line 8) comprising: a computer readable medium; and software instructions stored on the computer readable medium, wherein the software instructions are operable to: receive a request for the web page at an intermediate server (Col. 10 lines 13-20); forward the request to a target server (Col. 10 lines 39-52); retrieve the web page from a target web server (Col. 10 lines 13-20 and Col. 8 line 54-66); ensure that the web page will not be cached (Col. 9 lines 1-8 and Col.

23 lines 5-11); and change a dynamic link in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 27 - Col. Line 23 and note Claim 7).

19. With respect to Claim 15, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the software instructions are further operable to ensure that the web page will not be cached comprises setting the web page to expire immediately (Col. 23 lines 5-11).

20. With respect to Claim 16, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches wherein the dynamic link is a relative link, and wherein the software instructions are further operable to: if the relative link contains a base tag, modify the base tag to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65); and if the relative link does not contain the base tag, insert a reference base tag, wherein the reference base tag refers to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

21. With respect to Claim 17, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the software instructions are further operable to use a host name to define the target web server associated with the web page (Col. 9 lines 45-65).

22. With respect to Claim 18, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the software instructions are further operable to use a port to define the target web server associated with the web page (Col. 7 lines 37-46).

23. With respect to Claim 19, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the dynamic link is an absolute URL, and the software instructions are further operable to identify the absolute URL by a protocol (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 53 and Col. 6 lines 16-35).

24. With respect to Claim 20, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the software instructions are further operable to: identify a resource type according to a resource source tag in the web page; and mark the resource type (Col. 16 line 66 – Col. 17 line 11).

25. With respect to Claim 21 Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the software instructions are further operable to: change a document.domain script command to refer to a domain for the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 52- Col. 17 line 5).

26. With respect to Claim 27, Farber teaches a method for mediating a web page at an intermediate server (Col. 8 line 54 – Col. 9 line 8) comprising: retrieving the web page from a target web server (Col. 8 line 54-66); ensuring that the web page will not be cached (Col. 23 lines 5-11); identifying an absolute URL by a protocol (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23 and Col. 6 lines 16-35); and changing the absolute URL to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23).

27. With respect to Claim 28, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 27 and further teaches changing a relative URL in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

28. With respect to Claim 30, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 27 and further teaches the step of ensuring the web page will not be cached comprises setting the web page to expire immediately (Col. 23 lines 5-11).

29. With respect to Claim 31, Farber teaches a method for mediating a web page at an intermediate server (Col. 8 line 54 – Col. 9 line 8) comprising: retrieving the web

page from a target web server (Col. 8 line 54-66); ensuring that the web page will not be cached (Col. 23 lines 5-11); and changing a relative link in the web page to refer to the intermediate server, further comprising: if the relative link contains a base tag, modify the base tag to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65); and if the relative link does not contain the base tag, insert a reference base tag, wherein the reference base tag refers to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65); identifying an absolute URL by a protocol (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 53 and Col. 6 lines 16-35); and changing the absolute URL to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23).

30. With respect to Claim 32, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 31 and further teaches changing an absolute URL in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23 and Col. 6 lines 16-35).

31. With respect to Claim 34, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 31 and further teaches the step of ensuring the web page will not be cached comprises setting the web page to expire immediately (Col. 23 lines 5-11).

32. With respect to Claim 35, Farber teaches a method for mediating a web page at an intermediate server (Col. 8 line 54 – Col. 9 line 8) comprising: retrieving the web page from a target web server (Col. 8 line 54-66); ensuring that the web page is not cached (Col. 23 lines 5-11); and changing an absolute dynamic URL in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23 and Col. 6 lines 16-35) wherein the absolute dynamic URL is identified based on a protocol (Col. 16 line 51 -



Col. 17 line 53); and changing a relative link in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

33. With respect to Claim 37, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 35 and further teaches the step of ensuring the web page is not cached comprises setting the web page to expire immediately (Col. 23 lines 5-11).

34. With respect to Claim 38, Farber teaches a method of mediating a web page comprising: at an intermediate server: receiving a web page request from a browser; forwarding the web page request to a target web server; receiving the web page from the target web server; changing all supported links in the web page to refer to the intermediate server; and forwarding the web page to a browser.

35. With respect to Claim 39, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 38 and further teaches at the intermediate server: identifying an absolute dynamic link in the web page based on a protocol (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 53 and Col. 6 lines 16-35); and changing the absolute dynamic link to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23).

36. With respect to Claim 40, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 38 and further teaches at the intermediate server: identifying a resource in the web page (Col. 16 line 66 – Col. 17 line 11); marking the resource with a resource marking (Col. 16 line 66 – Col. 17 line 11); forwarding the resource marking to the browser (Col. 16 line 66 – Col. 17 line 11 and Col. 8 lines 63-67); and receiving a resource request from the browser for the resource that includes the resource marking (Col. 16 lines 28-35); at the

browser: generating the resource request that includes the resource marking (Col. 16 lines 28-35).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

37. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

38. Claims 9 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber in view of U.S. Patent 6,021,435 by Nielsen.

39. With respect to Claim 9, Farber teaches some types of links may possibly be unsupported (Col. 17 lines 28-36). Farber does not explicitly disclose an the use of an error message. Nielsen teaches using an error message (Col. 1 line 66 – Col. 2 line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Nielsen such that the method further comprises replacing an unsupported link with an error message. One would be motivated to have this as it increases the efficiency of user browsing (Col. 1 lines 45-50 of Nielsen).

40. With respect to Claim 22, Farber teaches some types of links may possibly be unsupported (Col. 17 lines 28-36). Farber does not explicitly disclose an the use of an error message. Nielsen teaches using an error message (Col. 1 line 66 – Col. 2 line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to take the system disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Nielsen such that the system further comprises software instructions which are further operable to replace an unsupported link with an error message. One would be motivated to have this as it increases the efficiency of user browsing (Col. 1 lines 45-50 of Nielsen).

41. Claims 10, 11, 23, 24, 29, 33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber in view of U.S. Patent 6,510,462 by Blumenau (Blumenau).

42. With respect to Claim 10, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose recording a set of creation details for a first cookie at the intermediate server. Blumenau teaches recording a set of creation details for a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Blumenau such that the method further comprises recording a set of creation details for a first cookie at the intermediate server. One would be motivated to have this as it enables accurate tracking of web usage (Col. 2 lines 21-23 and Col. 5 line 60 – Col. 6 line 3 of Blumenau).

43. With respect to Claim 11, Farber in view of Blumenau teaches all the limitations of Claim 10 and further teaches the set of creation details is recorded from an http-header (Col. 5 lines 60-67 of Blumenau).

44. With respect to Claim 23, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 22 but does not explicitly disclose recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. Blumenau

teaches recording a set of creation details for a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Blumenau such that the system further comprises software instructions further operable to record a set of creation details for a first cookie. One would be motivated to have this as it enables accurate tracking of web usage (Col. 2 lines 21-23 and Col. 5 line 60 – Col. 6 line 3 of Blumenau).

45. With respect to Claim 24, Farber in view of Blumenau teaches all the limitations of Claim 23 and further teaches software instructions further operable to record the set of creation details from an http-header (Col. 5 lines 60-67 of Blumenau).

46. With respect to Claim 29, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 27 but does not explicitly disclose recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. Blumenau teaches recording a set of creation details for a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Blumenau such that the method further comprises recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. One would be motivated to have this as it enables accurate tracking of web usage (Col. 2 lines 21-23 and Col. 5 line 60 – Col. 6 line 3 of Blumenau).

47. With respect to Claim 33, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 31 but does not explicitly disclose recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. Blumenau teaches recording a set of creation details for a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Blumenau such that the method further comprises recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. One would be motivated to have this as it enables accurate tracking of web usage (Col. 2 lines 21-23 and Col. 5 line 60 – Col. 6 line 3 of Blumenau).

48. With respect to Claim 36, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 35 but does not explicitly disclose recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. Blumenau teaches recording a set of creation details for a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Blumenau such that the method further comprises recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. One would be motivated to have this as it enables accurate tracking of web usage (Col. 2 lines 21-23 and Col. 5 line 60 – Col. 6 line 3 of Blumenau).

49. Claim 13 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber in view of "HTML: The Definitive Guide, Third Edition" by Musciano et al. (Musciano).

50. With respect to Claim 13, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose changing a form GET submission to a form POST submission. Musciano teaches that a form POST submission can be used instead of a form GET submission when both POST and GET are supported (Page 326, section 10.2.4.1 'POST or GET?'). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and

modify it as indicated by Musciano such that the method further comprises changing a form GET submission to a form POST submission. One would be motivated to have this as it would enhance the system by allowing servers with form processing limitations to handle forms with numerous fields or long text fields (Page 326, section 10.2.4.1 'POST or GET?').

51. With respect to Claim 26, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 but does not explicitly disclose changing a form GET submission to a form POST submission. Musciano teaches that a form POST submission can be used instead of a form GET submission when both POST and GET are supported (Page 326, section 10.2.4.1 'POST or GET?'). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Musciano such that the system further comprises software instructions which are further operable to change a form GET submission to a form POST submission. One would be motivated to have this as it would enhance the system by allowing servers with form processing limitations to handle forms with numerous fields or long text fields (Page 326, section 10.2.4.1 'POST or GET?').

***Allowable Subject Matter***

52. Claims 12, 25, 41 and 42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Response to Arguments**

53. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 09/09/04, with respect to Claims 12 and 25 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of Claims 12 and 25 has been withdrawn. The arguments, with respect to the remaining claims, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

54. Applicants argue - *"When the reflector modifies URLS, the reflector modifies the URLS to refer to a repeater rather than the reflector itself. Thus, to the extent the Examiner considers the reflector of Farber to be an intermediate server, the reflector does not modify links to refer to the reflector. Thus, the server that initially receives the request and forwards it to the target web server does not modify links in the response to refer to itself. Moreover, there is no motivation to modify Farber such that the reflector modifies links to refer to the reflector as Farber is concerned with distributing requests among multiple servers (i.e., load balancing) and not with ensuring all requests go through a particular server."*

a. The Examiner considers the "repeater" or Farber to be the intermediate server. Farber teaches a request for a web page is received by the reflector, chooses a repeater, and causes the client to redirect the request for the web page to that repeater (Col. 10 lines 13-20). Thus the repeater is receiving a request for the web page, which correlates to "receiving a request for the web page at an intermediate server" (From claim 1). The repeater will further forward the request to a target server (Col. 10 lines 39-52) and the requested web page is returned to the repeater. The repeater performs the URL rewriting steps (Col. 16 line 27 - Col. Line 23) in certain embodiments as explicitly noted by Claim 7 of Farber, which states "wherein the rewriting is performed by one of the repeater, the reflector, or another repeater".

55. Applicants argue - *"The ability to identify absolute dynamic links based on protocols allows the present invention to identify and modify absolute links embedded by Javascript, Visual Basic or other Scripts that are not indicated by anchors... This allows the present invention to identify links that are not identified by systems that rely on anchors or other tags to identify links. Farber, conversely, identifies links by tags or directives in the web page, not by the protocol of the link. There is no teaching or suggestion in the portions of Farber cited by the Examiner to identify absolute dynamic links based on a protocol as opposed to tags."*

b. The rewriting functionality taught by Farber (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23), can include the ability to rewrite URLs with Non-HTTP protocols such as "the File Transfer Protocol (FTP) and audio/video stream protocols". (Col. 17 lines 24-53). The invention of Farber must be capable of identifying URLs based on a protocol, otherwise it would not be able to distinguish between a HTTP link and a FTP link such that it can be rewritten as stated in Col. 17 lines 41-48. Therefore, Farber's teachings are within the scope of "identifying the absolute dynamic links based on a protocol".

56. Applicants argue - *"Farber, at col. 16, line 66 through col. 17, line 5, simply teaches that the resources are identified. There is no teaching or suggestion that the resource types or are marked in the manner of the present invention. Moreover, as Farber simply deals with load balancing, there is no motivation to mark the resource types in order to determine if a request is for a new web page or is based on an embedded resource."*

c. The examiner considers "marking the resource type" broadly.

Furthermore, no indication is given in the claim language (for Claims 7, 20 and



40) as to the functionality of the marking. As such, the rewriting of a URL (Col. 17 lines 5-10), which can be considered a resource, is interpreted as being within the scope of "marking a resource" or a "resource marking".

57. Applicants argue - *"Once requests are redirected to the repeater, through the redirection function or modification of the URLs, requests to the repeaters do not have to go through the reflector again. Therefore, there would be not motivation to record the creation details of cookies at the reflector to provide accurate tracking of web usage as suggested by the Examiner."*

d. The Examiner considers the repeater to be the intermediate server. Since the repeater is responsible for serving received requests for web resources (Col. 10 lines 39-53), there is sufficient motivation to record creation details of cookies as they provide accurate tracking of web usage.

### **Conclusion**

58. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any


extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 571-272-3986. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
David Lazaro  
November 30, 2004

  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER